

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application and the helpful comments. However, favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following comments.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-20 and 22-28 are pending, with Claims 1, 7, 13, 20 and 26-28 being independent.

Claims 1, 3, 5 – 7, 9, 11 - 13, 15, 17 - 20, 22, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,577,746, hereinafter *Evans*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,127, hereinafter *Ikenoue*. Claims 4, 10, 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Evans* in view of *Ikenoue* and U.S. Patent No. 3,760,159, hereinafter *Davis*.

In the response filed on October 12, 2007, Applicants stated that:

In the rejection, the Examiner alleges that column 2, lines 25 – 30 and 61 – 65, of *Evans* corresponds to the storage unit in claim 1 that stores the detected pieces of additional information in association with location information *thereof*, i.e., the location of the watermark. However, that section of *Evans* does not indicate that the watermark includes storage information concerning the location of the watermark. The location information referred to in *Evans* concerns the location (size, rotation, etc.) where the imported image is to be inserted into the original image. It does not concern the location of the watermark. Accordingly, *Evans* does not teach or suggest the claimed storage unit.

The Examiner *correctly* points out, in the latest response, that the independent claims do not recite that the watermark itself includes storage information concerning the location of the watermark. However, column 2, lines 25 – 30 and 61 – 65, of *Evans* does not disclose a storage unit that stores the detected pieces of additional information in association with location information *thereof*, it being understood that "location information *thereof*" refers to location information of

the additional information. The "location" information referred to in *Evans* concerns the location (size, rotation, etc.) in the original image where the imported image is to be inserted into the original image. It does not concern the location of the watermark, i.e., the location of where the additional information is stored in the original image.

With regard to column 2, lines 62 – 65, of *Evans*, Applicants submit that this teaches that the watermark detector discerns the placement of the imported image within the original image, not the location of the watermark itself. Accordingly, *Evans* does not teach or suggest the claimed storage unit. Neither *Evans* nor *Ikenoue* discloses that subject matter, either separately or in combination.

The Examiner's comments bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Official Action are not understood. The Examiner appears to argue that the *Evans* watermark is updated. However, the portion of *Evans* quoted by the Examiner at the end of page 2 of the Official Action clearly states that it is the picture, not the watermark, that is updated ("...for a picture to be updated..."). In the event that the Examiner persists with this interpretation, a more detailed clarification is respectfully requested. Using a watermark to update an image does not mean that the watermark itself is updated.

With regard to the Examiner's comments at the end of page 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner relies upon *Ikenoue* for an alleged teaching of embedding a new piece of additional information including updated information into first image data at a location that does not overlap locations where the detected pieces of information are embedded. However, the claim language states that:

(2) embeds, when the judgment result of the analyzing unit is negative, a new piece of additional information including updated information into the image data at a location that does not overlap locations where the detected pieces of additional information are embedded, **by**

referring to the stored location information, the updated information being equivalent to the predetermined information.

As set forth above, *Evans* does not concern the location of the watermark, i.e., the location of where the additional information is stored in the original image. And, the Examiner does not allege that *Ikenoue* teaches using the stored location information to determine where to embed the new piece of additional information. Accordingly, neither *Evans* nor *Ikenoue* teaches using the stored location information to determine where to embed the new piece of additional information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections of the pending claims should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth in the response filed on October 12, 2007, as modified by the foregoing comments.

In summary, Applicants allege that:

Evans does not teach or suggest the claimed storage unit;

Evans does not teach that the additional information (e.g., the watermark) is updated; and

neither *Evans* nor *Ikenoue* teaches using the stored location information to determine where to embed the new piece of additional information.

For at least those reasons, the alleged combination of *Evans* and *Ikenoue*, as proposed by the Examiner, does not disclose the combination of features defined by Claim 1, and Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 7, 13, 20 and 26-28 are allowable for similar reasons as Claim 1 with regard to similar claim language.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 22, 24 and 25 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims.

With regard to claims 4, 10, 16 and 23, *Davis* does not overcome the deficiencies of the rejections of the independent claims from which Claims 4, 10, 16 and 23 depend. For at least that reason, they are allowable too.

Based on the above-observations, it is respectfully requested that all the rejections set forth be reconsidered and withdrawn. Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 28, 2008

By:



William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620